

JEFF CAR 2015 Design Review Team S106 Meeting Notes

Meeting #38 June 13, 2016

Time: 10-11 CT

I. Attendees

| Role | Name | Participated |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| DRT Member | Mike Ward | |
| DRT Member | Maggie Hales | |
| DRT Member | Vern Remiger | X |
| DRT Member | Judith Deel | X |
| DRT Member | Toni Prawl | |
| DRT Member | Bill Hart | |
| DRT Member | Karen Bode Baxter | |
| DRT Member | Kathryn Thomas | X |
| Facilitator | Margo Brooks | X |
| Facilitator | Greg Cody | |
| Great River Greenways | Lonny Boring | |
| CAR2015 | Anna Leavey | X |
| JEFF | Ed Dobbs | |
| JEFF | Kathy Schneider | |
| JEFF | Rhonda Schier | X |
| JEFF | Frank Mares | |
| CRM Team | Susan Dolan | |
| CRM Team | Randy Biallis | |
| CRM Team | Tim Schilling | |
| CRM Team | Bob Moore | X |
| CRM Team | Al O'Bright | |
| NPS-WASO | Jeffery Durbin | |
| NPS-Midwest Region | Don Stevens | |
| MVVA | James Smith | |
| PCAV | Chance Baragary | |
| NPS-DSC | Chris Lewis | |

II. EarthCam Installation

CAR2015 has proposed adding two Earth Cam cameras to the Arch windows to allow people below who cannot ascend to the top of the Arch to see in real time what people at the Arch viewing platform are experiencing. The view would be broadcast to a facsimile of the Arch keystone within the museum directly below the center of the Arch.

Two options for mounting and encasing the cameras were discussed. Option 1 would enclose an entire window on each side of the Arch in a carpet-covered structure that would replicate the angles and materials currently within the viewing area. Option 2 would enclose the camera within a much smaller structure that would cover only half of a window on each side. The size of the structure would depend in part on how the lens was situated within the window. If it were close to flush with the glass, then a bigger enclosure would be necessary. If the lens protruded from the glass, then the enclosure could be smaller.

NOTES Meeting #38: June 13, 2016

Discussion

CAR2015, the SHPO and some park CRM staff preferred Option 2 to Option 1 because the enclosure was smaller and did not cover the entire window, which is a character-defining feature of the Arch. Other park staff expressed strong preference for Option 1 because it did not call attention to the alterations. Both Options were declared to be reversible and would not be adverse effects.

The park wanted assurances that the gaskets would not produce residue over time that could streak the Arch. Additionally, the park and SHPO requested that the lens be situated as close to flush with the window glass as possible to obscure the lenses from every angle.

Finally, the park asked if a camera could show people below what was happening within the viewing area itself. Vern Remiger stated that they want to outfit the Arch and Museum with Wi-Fi so that people could share the experience over their cell phones, but agreed that they could likely mount a camera within the maintenance area of the viewing platform.

Decision

The DRT approved the proposal with the caveat that CAR 2015 investigate the materials to ensure that they would not harm or streak the Arch, that the lenses be as close to flush with the glass as possible, and that they include cameras showing both the view and the viewing platform. Since neither enclosure option is an adverse effect, the DRT will allow the park to pick the final option for enclosing the camera based on the size of the enclosure needed and park operational needs.

III. Future DRT Meeting Dates

TBD